Standards Committee Meeting

February 9, 2022

[Zoom link for meetings](https://virginiatech.zoom.us/j/89631511588?pwd=eXdSYzVxNlowK2FwR3dUQ1o1NzJjUT09)

[Standards Committee shared folder](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/106h7m1BsH9bw9ImtQH_eMWHlDFnaPKEe?usp=sharing)

Attendees:

1. We still need a co-chair!
2. Updates
	1. Co-chair
		1. See agenda items below
		2. Submitted recommendation list for new members for next year
		3. SAA Leaders Forum: Strategic Plan Dashboard Feedback
	2. Council
		1. Council meeting is next week
	3. Technical Subcommittees
		1. TS-DACS
			1. Focus on submitting comments on [RiC draft turned in last week](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1IDix9zbRJLe8HXi5xX30KCbMqRSuNpv7/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=116021604645940951042&rtpof=true&sd=true)
			2. Picking back up on principles work
			3. Backlog of issues on Github; forthcoming revisions to share (minor and some major/minor)
		2. TS-EAS
			1. EAS met in January and are working on CPF submission
			2. Questions from EAC-CPF team about formatting of submission packet (lm)
				1. "We have handled the revision process in GitHub, gathering what needs to be done as well as comments both internal and from the community. This means that there are a lot of issues and we would suggest that instead of giving all the issues and their threads in the submission as pdf's or as links to all the issues that one link that gives the view of the listing of all issues is provided together with specific issues where there have been extensive discussion and community feedback. Would this be ok?

This makes sense, but it might be helpful if someone has an example they can give us to make sure it includes everything we’re asking for

* + - * 1. "Regarding announcements made, is it ok with just links to the announcements or are they needed to be in the package as PDF's?"

Yes, links to announcements, as long as the links work, are fine!

* + 1. TS-GRD
			1. Working on a plan for immediate needs and request for extension
		2. TS-AFG
			1. No updates
	1. Others?
		1. Accessioning Best Practices
			1. No updates
		2. Education Committee
			1. Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies (GPAS) will be forthcoming (probably next month, since we’re working with them on the submission package)
1. Guidelines for Accessible Archives for People with Disabilities
	1. Recommendation submitted to Council for upcoming meeting
2. Museum Archives Guidelines
	1. Recommendation submitted to Council for upcoming meeting
3. Other items or updates?
	1. Working on purchase of requested ISO standards
		1. Request submitted as mid-year funding
	2. Hopefully for next meeting, we can talk about a Standards Portal sustainability plan
4. Discussion: Revision of [Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard](https://www2.archivists.org/governance/handbook/section7/groups/Standards/Procedures-Review-Approval-SAA-Developed-Standard)
	1. What do we want to see in a standard revision that isn’t in the process now?
		1. Expectation of consultation with SAA Diversity Committee or acknowledgement/inclusion of diversity statement?
			1. Revisors should meet with the Diversity Committee and with Standards to earlier on so those groups can provide suggestions
			2. and/or meeting with Diversity at the point a revision group is being formed
		2. Acknowledgement of interaction with other standards (whether SAA approved or otherwise)? (came up at Dec meeting)
		3. “Expected effect/impact on individuals and institutions”
			1. More useful to indicate who a standard applies to/what is the stated need (or indicate this in addition to the bullet point)
		4. I.A←provide additional language?
		5. Notification for SAA Expert Groups starting a revision
		6. Kira will create a Google Doc version of the procedures for comment
		7. Reach out Diversity Committee
5. A4BLiP is still working with Description Section on sponsorship
6. Next meeting: March 10, 2022